

CMS FUNCTIONAL REQUIREMENTS (2002)

ADDENDUM 4

TECHNICAL

1.2.A	Effective From, To	<p>Q. Is "effective from and to" required on all Code Tables?</p> <p>A. It is not necessary to have effective from and to on all tables, e.g., hair and eyes color tables. Minimally, they should be on docket tables and the accounting/distribution tables. See Addendum 3 for clarifications of the same question.</p>
-------	--------------------	---

DMV

1	Functional Requirement 8.1.2	<p>Q. The DMV functional requirement 8.1.2 states that the Fixed Format manual is DL 578 when it should be DL 378, correct?</p> <p>A. Yes, DL 378.</p>
2	Case event 1a	<p>Q. In DMV traffic case event 1a, the expected outcome indicates that violation information should be returned from an inquiry on a driver with no priors. Shouldn't the expected outcome be that no driver abstract history (violation information) is returned for the driver?</p> <p>A. Display the subject's record which will either show no priors or will display a message that there are no priors.</p>
3	Case event 1c	<p>In case event 1c, the expected outcome is a DMV response that no record exists following an out-of-state driver's license inquiry on NY8409703. Our system does not allow inquiries using DL numbers longer than 8 characters, matching the DMV system limits and eliminating unnecessary interface activity.</p> <p>A. Although DMV may only accept eight digits in the DL# field, we still want to see that if an operator tries to inquire on this DL#, the system displays that the record does not exist, or an error is displayed saying that the data in the DL# field is not formatted correctly.</p>
4	Case Events 3a and 3b.	<p>Q. Traffic case events 3a and 3b call for traffic school ineligibility/eligibility to be displayed following DMV driver's license history retrieval. Can this requirement be satisfied with a DMV driver's license inquiry showing prior enrollment or lack of enrollment (from which eligibility can be determined by the user)?</p> <p>A. We don't want the user to have to make that decision, we want the system to determine traffic school eligibility using the DMV record and the court's rules, and display the eligibility condition somewhere on the case record.</p>
5	Case Events 5a and 8a	<p>Q. In case event 5a, the expected outcome to display the FTA hold sent doesn't mention that fine information also be sent, while traffic case event 8a states that the FTP should be submitted ". . with amount owed. . ." We would submit fine</p>

		<p>information for the FTA as well as the FTP, since we assume participation in the FTA and FTP Fine Collectors Program at the court level. Is this okay, or do we need to control submission of FTA and FTP fine amounts separately?</p> <p>A. Sending the amount on both FTA and FTP abstracts would be acceptable. Since some court opts to send fine amounts, both FTAs and FTPs and some don't, the function should be capable of being turned off if a court does not opt to send fine amounts.</p>
6	Case Event 6a	<p>Q. Traffic case event 6a expected outcome states fine information should be submitted with abstract of conviction, DD1; I just want to confirm that by "fine information" you do not also expect fine amounts, which are submitted only for FTA's and FTP's, per the DMV manual.</p> <p>A. We do not want fine amounts sent on a conviction abstract. The expected outcome should read, "Display that Bail Forfeiture disposition code was sent, along with DMV return code."</p>

DOJ

1		<p>Q. We received a revised copy of the Electronic Disposition Reporting Manual from DOJ. We spent some time reviewing the new manual and have discovered that several fields have been eliminated. One of those fields, "Court First Plea" field appears in the DOJ certification script. Is the A.O.C. going to modify the script according to the new manual or should we proceed with the current script?</p> <p>A. The script is not going to be modified since the changes affect only one field. The "Court First Plea" field need not be included. The new additional fields are not required as part of the 2002-2003 certification evaluations.</p>
2		<p>Q. The Functional Requirement asks for the JUS 8715 form to be displayed, could you please confirm that?</p> <p>A. The form need not be displayed, the required information in the script, i.e., step records and mandatory fields should be.</p>
3		<p>Q. In scenario 3, the code 'identifier' is 'H&S'. The DOJ manual say that this is a 2 position field. Shouldn't this really be 'HS'?</p> <p>A. Yes, it should be HS.</p>